

DAYLIGHT

Creation Science for Catholics

Number 3

Spring 1992

Contents

Editorial.....	2
"Bang goes Evolution !" by A.Nevard.....	4
European Creationist Congress - speakers	7
"Why I no longer believe in Evolution" by E.Thornton	8
"As they say... evolutionists quotations on the origin of apes and man " selected by S.Wylie.	14
Book review of "Creation Rediscovered", by Anthony Fraser.....	16
Creation Science Organisations and Sources	18

—ooOoo—

Editor: A.L.G.Nevard.

Address: 19 Francis Avenue, St.Albans,
Herts AL3 6BL, England.

Subscription (4 issues) : UK & Ireland £5 .
USA/Australia US\$15 cash, or Stg.equiv.

EDITORIAL

Many thanks to all of you who have renewed your subscriptions for 1992, and those of you who kindly added a donation. As a result, we have been able to expand Daylight again to 20 pages, which I hope will continue to be possible.

I also thank three members who have already offered to help in translating "Science et Foi", and several others who have sent me their own articles. I now have ample material for several issues, and I am very grateful for their kindness, but I regret that some are too lengthy for inclusion in our newsletter. I must add that I cannot accept responsibility for unsolicited manuscripts, and reserve the right to edit or decline to publish items submitted. Please enclose a s.a.e. if you require articles to be returned.

Practical creativity invited ! I would like to make further improvements in the style of our publications. I would welcome suggestions for a more professional design for our title page from anyone with expertise in that field. Perhaps a suitable 'logo' could be invented ? I feel sure there is untapped talent among you !

"Creation Rediscovered", by Gerry Keane, has received glowing reviews in Christian Order and Apropos. I am grateful to Anthony Fraser for permission to reproduce his review from Apropos***. I understand that the book is selling quite well, as it becomes more widely publicised. I have personally sold about 20 copies, mainly by giving copies 'on loan' to people who I thought would appreciate it. After they read it, most were glad to give me £8.95 !

*** Apropos, [redacted] Road, Portree,
[redacted]

PRO FIDE FORUM

Creation Science - the Catholic revival.

by Anthony Nevard

**At St.Vincent's Convent, Carlisle Place,
Victoria, London.**

Thursday 21st May 1992 at 7 p.m.

"The speaker will explore the nature of Creation Science, and outline its implications in relation to the Genesis account of Creation and Catholic Doctrine. A final discussion will focus on the contribution Catholics can make to this aspect of renewal in the Church."

A Great New Book

***Creation Rediscovered*
By Gerry Keane**

Malachi B. Martin, the well known author, describes *Creation Rediscovered* as "a dream book, the sort of book you always wanted to have at hand for quick reference to, and for in-depth study. It is a book that will help you to see the truth about the deception: Evolution theory."

He concludes his review by saying:

"Keane's volume is a book that every Catholic should read."

**The Burial of Evolution as a Theory That Never Worked
about an Event that Never Was."**

NOW AVAILABLE FROM "DAYLIGHT" - including postage-

UK - £9 ; rest of world - £10 (stocks limited).

BANG GOES EVOLUTION !

by Anthony Nevard

The massive 'media-hype' devoted to the supposed proof of the Big Bang theory, reported in late April, bore little resemblance to the size of its cause - the ripples in microwave radiation of 0.00003 degree (!) which it has been claimed have been discovered in the universe.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 'hype' means: "misleading publicity [20th c.; orig.unkn.] I would suggest in this case that the word is an abbreviation of 'hyperbole', defined as: "exaggerated statement not meant to be taken literally." As Mark Twain might have put it, referring to the universe, "The report of its birth was an exaggeration !"

Expert opinions quoted in an article in the '**Daily Telegraph**' (April 25 1992) included nine scientists and an Anglican Bishop, under the provocative heading : '**Cosmology v Theology**'. Predictably, it was headed by the cautious, modest view of Professor **Stephen Hawking**: "The discovery of the century, if not of all time." (!) However, some scientists were more reserved, for example **Sir Bernard Lovell**, pioneer in radio-astronomy, "Many of us feel that there could be other interpretations." **John Barrow**, Professor of Astronomy, Sussex University, said: "It is not a sensational discovery." **Michael Rowan Robinson**, Professor of Astronomy, London University, revealed his position: "This is a tremendous triumph of the human intellect. I don't think this discovery will change anyone's religious views. I don't believe in God but I think people who do don't depend on astronomical results for their faith."

In a recent issue of **Daylight** (No.1, Autumn 1991), several experts were quoted criticising the Big Bang theory. Yet **Adrian Berry**, the **Daily Telegraph** Science Correspondent, largely overlooked these problem areas, while he indulged in Biblical exegesis. He pointed out,

"The cause of the Big Bang...is likely to remain an impenetrable mystery, perhaps for ever beyond our mental reach. This is because the Bang was not only the beginning of space and matter, it was also the beginning of time." A fair point, but then he gratuitously comments : "The second verse of the Bible, that speaks of space at the beginning as being 'void', is therefore inaccurate. The great explosion some 15,000 million years ago did not emerge into empty space. It emerged into 'nothingness'. There was literally nothing there." This is semantic hair-splitting, between 'void', 'empty', and 'nothing there'. Should even a fundamentalist expect such subtle 'accuracy' ? Isn't it strange how scientists always become 'literalists' when they are trying to prove the Bible is wrong ! The spirit of Galileo lives on, eager to set Science against Scripture. But at least Galileo didn't misquote it. Look at how Genesis 1:2 begins: "And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was across the face of the deep." No mention of 'space' at all ! It was not the Author of Scripture who was inaccurate at all ! No wonder many people mistrust the statements of scientists !

According to Berry, "Everything that happened after the Big Bang has been governed by Einstein's general theory of relativity. In other words, a massive object such as a planet or a star creates the time and space that surround it." [emphasis Berry's]. The equivocal use of the word 'creates' apparently confers the credit for the Creation not on God but on Einstein ! How he managed to backdate 'his' theory from AD 1915 to operate from the beginning of time is beyond natural explanation !

There are sound scientific reasons for doubting the assumptions on which the Big Bang theory rests, such as the expansion of the universe, the constancy of the speed of light, relativity theory itself and the supposed vast age of the cosmos. Nor is the logic involved beyond criticism.

For example, scientists are quick to point out that 'Days of Creation' in Genesis would have no meaning if there was no relative motion of the Sun and the Earth from which to measure the lapse of time. How then can they babble on about 'millions of years before even the solar system existed' ?

The whole billion-year scenario is a materialistic myth, based on scientifically and philosophically false assumptions, devised to support the fallacy of evolution, itself intended to do away with belief in God. The publicity hype about 'microwaves' is another smokescreen to try to hide the undeniable fact that Evolution Theory is bankrupt, and the news is getting about !

Even Berry has to admit, "Some theorists suggest in desperation God or a superior intelligence from another dimension created the universe either by design or accident." For cosmologists, we are told, "the key question is whether the expansion is slowing down...or whether it will continue for ever." This means, we are told, will the universe go on for 20 billion years or "ten to the power of 10^{16} years ?" ! It seems that, as interest turns from Creation to the 'Big Crash', such scientists descend from the sublime to the ridiculous ; hardly surprising when they enter the realms of philosophy and theology, in which they are generally both ignorant and incompetent, scorning the authority of both God's Church and His Word. Their motive is to exclude any idea of God acting in the world here-and-now, but to push Him into the remote past or future. Thus He can be fearlessly treated like a harmless 'absentee landlord', free from any inconvenient moral restrictions.

The real issue is that the Theory of Evolution has been killed by the evidence of science - the 'Big Bang' is the noise made by cosmologists trying to drown out the sound of the shot !

The Fifth European Creationist Congress

17-20 August 1992

High Leigh, Hoddesdon, Herts, England.

Apply to: BCS,

SY.

Det

Paul Ballance : the origins of the New Age Movement and its influence on modern theology.

Guy Berthault: Significance of cycles in sedimentology.

Nigel Crompton: Cybernetic processes in cellular systems.

Graham Fisher: A possible flood ice age and earth division mechanism (an astro-catastrophic scenario).

Paul Garner: Catastrophic volcanism in the Borrowdale Volcanic Group (Ordovician) of the English Lake District.

Sigrid Hartwig-Scherer: In search of Eden.

Alan Hodson: Genesis 1-11: Foundations under attack.

Andrey Ivanov and Dmitri Kouznetsov: Theory of biofractionation of stable isotopes in palaeochronology.

Per Landgren: On the origin of "species" : Darwin and the ideological roots of the species concept.

Mats Molen: There really has been an Ice Age.

Siegfried Scherer: Evolutionary origin of Plastids?

Joachim Scheven: Gleanings from Glossopteris.

David Watson: Keynote address.

H, Weigers: The mythology of science.

Why I no longer believe in evolution

by E.M.Thornton

A chance meeting with an embryologist raised my first doubts about evolution. No-one in his discipline, he assured me, now believed in the "ontology recapitulates phylogeny" theory. That an embryo retraces its evolutionary history in the womb had seemed to me the most significant evidence of the truth of evolution, an attitude I later realised rested on a credulous belief in the infallibility of scientists and a naive respect for the printed word. (I later learnt that Ernst Haeckel, Professor of Zoology at Jena, who originated the theory, not only altered his illustrations of embryos to support his case, but actually printed the same plate of an embryo three times, labelling one human, the second a dog and the third a rabbit, "to show their similarity", a misdeed for which he was arraigned before the university authorities, though succeeding in retaining his chair. Yet I have seen very similar illustrations in quite recent text-books.)

The vestigial organ theory has met with a similar fate. Tonsils, adenoids and appendices, now known to be part of the body's immune defences, were considered to be vestiges at least up to the 1950's. When evolutionary fervour was at its height around the turn of the century, other structures such as uvulas were considered vestigial and removed wholesale. Arbuthnot Lane, an influential surgeon and ardent evolutionist, convinced the large intestine was a vestigial organ, removed colons in their hundreds. What with the vestigial organs and the alleged disorders due to man's adoption of the erect posture, this era of surgical history has been described as, "a riot of operating by and on neurotics either to divide bands, to remove colons or to fix organs that would have delighted a Voltaire."

Further disillusion resulted from my researches in medical history. I learnt of the primitive state of medicine and science in Darwin's day and in particular that the Aristotelian doctrine of spontaneous generation was still extant in the decade of the Origin of Species and long after - not, admittedly, in its crude form as expressed in the recipe of the famous seventeenth-century physician, Van Helmont, for the generation of mice from old bran and a dirty shirt, but on the microscopic level, where it was still a fiercely-debated issue between Pasteur and his followers, and the Darwinians, to whom it gave the advantage of pre-empting awkward questions on life's origins. In the face of all the evidence, the Darwinians steadfastly clung to the doctrine of spontaneous generation with a tenacity that showed it was clearly a vital element of their case. Hence their attacks on Pasteur, equalling in acrimony the present day onslaughts on the creationists by the evolutionary establishment.

The origin of life presented no difficulty for those early evolutionists - spontaneous generation accounted for the organisms from which the higher life forms evolved. Now it has proved to be the rock on which the evolutionary theory is foundering. "The origins of life appear to be almost a miracle," admitted Francis Crick recently, "so many are the conditions which would have to be satisfied to get it going." When Mendel's work was rediscovered at the turn of the century and the genes and chromosomes identified in the following decades, the evolutionary theory was salvaged by the random mutations hypothesis. It is this theory that is currently causing the most headaches in the evolutionary establishment today. For a random mutation to occur, there would have had to be a gene in existence in the first place. How did this complex structure itself come into being ? The classic chicken-and-egg situation presented by the genetic code still defies resolution. Proteins are formed according to the instructions coded in DNA. But DNA itself cannot form without proteins. Which, therefore, came first ? And

how did the DNA know how to code for a protein ? So formidable is this obstacle that scientists like Crick and Orgel, Wickramasinghe and Hoyle have abandoned the problem altogether and propose that life arrive from outer space.

The evolutionary theory proposes that life evolved from simple to complex life forms. It is rapidly becoming obvious that there are no simple life forms. The construction of the cell wall of the lowly bacterium involves at least a dozen enzymes. Whole books have been written about the tiny pollen grain whose construction is still more complex. The explosion of research in recent decades has, in fact, revealed more and more evidence of all biological life being characterised by complexity, organisation and regulatory mechanisms. As expressed by Professor Iverson of Norway, there is, "a continuous exchange of material and information at molecular, cellular and organ levels." Referring to regulatory feedback mechanisms, the professor describes, "a multitude of such regulatory feedback principles at the molecular level in the living cell."

Once doubt sets in about evolution, objections to the theory crowd in thick and fast. Here are just a few in my progression away from its now-preceived simplistic and naive propositions :

Evolutionary scientists cursorily dismiss the evidence for purposeful design in the universe as being only apparent. The eye is the usual organ cited in the argument from design, but my favourite is the ear. The mammalian inner ear, with the snail-shaped cochlea resolving acoustic signals into their individual frequency components and into the neural auditory code by means of thousands of hair-cells generating electrical potentials, is something that scientists working on cochlear implants for the deaf have been unable to replicate. After years of research they are only able to come up with a crude approximation of the real thing.

Survey of any bodily system, with its mutually-dependent structure and function negates the postulated evolutionary timescale of millions of

years. The vertebrate circulatory system is an example. Without its intricate system of vessels, valves and a central pump, the heart, to drive the blood around, and without the nodes in the heart generating the electrical impulses that cause it to beat, the blood would simply stagnate in the lower extremities. The complete system would therefore have to be 'in situ' from the very beginning for the creature to survive. Similarly, the mechanism by means of which the blood flows freely within the vessels yet outside the body clots to seal a wound, is the result of complicated, finely-balanced biochemical interactions. Without this mechanism the smallest cut would result in fatal haemorrhage.

While we are on the circulation, could any blind random process be capable of the purposeful pre-planning for future events that we consistently encounter in nature? The fundamental changes that take place in the foetal circulation after birth, when the child is no longer dependent on the maternal circulation for its oxygen but begins to breathe through its own lungs is one example. The pulmonary arteries, previously closed and functionless, open up while the ductus arteriosus, a foetal vessel connecting the left pulmonary artery and the descending aorta, closes. The foramen ovale, an opening between the two sides of the heart, closes so that they are now separated. A completely different circulation geared to lung breathing is established. How could such pre-planned purposeful events be explained by random mutations even over millions of years?

Darwin and his generation knew nothing of growth hormone and the somatomedins. They evidently believed that plants and animals, like Topsy, "just grew". To me, the most significant aspect of the fossil record is that the characteristic shape, symmetry and uniformity within species of even the most ancient specimens showing that growth hormone must have been present from the very beginning. So our simple primitive "ancestors" were not so simple after all. (In fact, growth hormone has recently been discovered even in unicellular organisms and is known to be present in every species.)

The objections outlined above are only some of my personal difficulties with the evolutionary theory. Others will have many more. Why do not evolutionists face up to the very real problems with their theory? I suspect it is because of the legacy inherited from Darwin. His simplistic evolutionary scheme, heavily dependent on spontaneous generation, was handed down to them as established fact. I have been amazed by the imprecision of the data accepted by evolutionists - the wide-ranging deductions made from a fragment of bone or a single tooth for instance, or the assumption that fossil bones belonged to a fire-making creature if a handful of ashes is found in the same cave. I have also been struck by the looseness of the terminology they employ. They write papers on "The evolution of the kidney", or some such structure or organ, when in fact they are only describing its comparative anatomy. They speak constantly of "biological systems" without realising that the very existence of such systems negates the random mutation theory. They postulate sequences of accidental events to account for the complexity of the universe while in practice endowing this sequence with a persona and with intelligent thought-processes in such phrases as "Evolution has provided for..." or "Evolution has ordained..."

Evolutionists speak of "evolution in action" when, in fact, they are only describing the limited effect of natural selection on the numbers of a species - industrial melanism in moths is one example. This year's [1991] Croonian lecturer at the Royal Society perpetrated the same fallacy when describing the changed landscape around an industrial plant which had polluted the soil with copper. The hardier plants which were resistant to the copper survived while the less resistant plants died, resulting in the transformation of the landscape which Professor Bradshaw described as "evolution in action". However, the professor must be counted on the side of the angels, as the burden of his talk, which was entitled "Limits to Evolution" was that most plants and animals do not adapt, but simply die out. There are, he

pointed out, many more extinct species than there are currently alive.

[Note : presumably this last statement is assuming millions of undiscovered 'intermediate species' required by the assumption of evolution - Ed.]

Any such tentative moves away from the evolutionary theory, however, will probably evoke fierce resistance from the evolutionary 'Mafia' to whom the theory has evidently become a pseudo-religion - as witnessed by the Nature editorial which accused the Natural History Museum of "heresy" on account of a brochure which had used the phrase : "If the evolutionary theory is true..." It is encouraging that the editorial received a resounding rebuttal from 22 biologists at the Museum. "How is it that a journal such as yours," they asked, "that is devoted to science and its practice, can advocate that theory be presented as fact ?" How indeed, one might echo .

---oooOooo---

Miss Elizabeth Thornton was one of the founding Committee members of CESHE:UK in 1987, and has continued to give her support to our movement. She is a lay Fellow of the Royal Society of Medicine and a member of the History of Medicine Section. Employed as research assistant and departmental librarian at a major London teaching hospital, she has written several learned books, including "Hypnotism, Hysteria and Epilepsy: An Historical Synthesis." (1976) and "The Freudian Fallacy - Freud and Cocaine" (1983).

"AS THEY SAY..."

Quotations of evolutionist scientists on

The Origin of Apes and Man.

selected by **Stephen Wylie.**

"In spite of recent finds, the time and place of origin of Order Primates remains shrouded in mystery."

Elwyn L.Symons, Ann.N.Y.Acad.of Sci., 167:319 (1969).

"Modern apes, for instance, seem to have sprung out of nowhere. They have no yesterday, no fossil record."

Dr.Lyall Watson, "The Water People", Science Digest, May 1982, p.44.

"Where man came from has been the subject of speculation since the dawn of history. While scientists still don't know the answer, fundamentalists cling to belief in divine creation."

Andrea Dorfman, "Evolution: How did Apes lead to Man ?", Science Digest, October 1985, p.50.

"Based on the fossils as we know them, Homo [Man] is as old as Australopithecus [a species of extinct Ape from which some evolutionists believe Man evolved - Ed.] (One can still argue that Homo evolved from an older, as yet undiscovered Australopithecus. But no evidence supports such a claim, and I could speculate with equal justice that Australopithecus evolved from an unknown Homo.) "

Prof.Stephen Jay Gould, "Ever Since Darwin:Reflections in Natural History", Pelican Books, 1980, p.60.

"No fossil or any physical evidence directly connects man to ape."

John Gliedman, "Miracle Mutations", Science Digest, February 1982, p.90.

"Many ordinary people, reading the works of a single populariser, believe that the riddle of human origins has been solved. In no case is this true, and all the ideas in print today- including our own- are more or less naked speculation."

Dr. John Gribbin and Dr. Jeremy Cherfas, "The Monkey Puzzle - Are Apes Descended from Man ?" Granada, 1983, p.160.

"The key question of the origin of the Homo lineage remains unaddressed. A large gap in the fossil record has so far made it impossible to determine where the Homo line branched off from the australopithecines."

Scientific American, October 1986, p.70B.

"..Lucy [Australopithecus afarensis, Ed.] who would be at one end [of the Homo line, Ed.] is simply not a human being; Richard Leakey's '1470', [Homo habilis, Ed.] who would be at the other end, is."

"..It's got that great gap in the middle between 3 and 2 million [years]. There are no good fossils in there," [i.e. between 'Lucy' and '1470' ,Ed.]

Dr. Donald C. Johanson, "Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind", Granada, London, 1981, p.287, 296.

BOOK REVIEW - "CREATION REDISCOVERED"

Author: Gerard J. Keane

Publisher: Credis Pty Ltd, P.O. Box 108, Australia. pp.302, PB.

Scarcely any scientific book or programme concerning "Nature" fails to genuflect before what Michael Denton calls, 'The great cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century' - the Darwinian theory of Evolution.

Teilhard de Chardin was a passable clairvoyant, despite being a poor scientist, when he remarked that evolution 'Is a general condition to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must bow and which they must satisfy henceforward if they are to be thinkable and true.' But his prophecy only became true because the "evolution establishment", which permeated all walks of life and places of influence, constrained all discussion concerning evolution within this Teilhardian strait-jacket - Anything which does not bow to evolution is thus unthinkable and untrue. The mere suggestion that creation is the work of God and executed in the manner described by Genesis and thus might be considered as a valid alternative to Darwinian or Neo-Darwinian evolution is enough to send the "thinking and chattering" classes into paroxysms of laughter and to have the suggester forever designated a religious "nut".

Gerard Keane has taken this risk and asserts that an objective appraisal of the origin of man and the universe in the light of science is accommodated more easily within the Creation model than that of Darwinian evolution. Mr Keane faces a great obstacle in presenting his case and it lies in the fact that there are few adults or children who will not balk at accepting a Creation model in which the world was created in Seven Days of 24 hours and in which the world is considered to be around less than 10,000 years old - Such is the power of sustained brainwashing by the Darwinian evolutionists. However Mr Keane takes on this monumental task and does so by attempting to prove that the Creation Scientist's opinion is worthy of consideration and more so

than that of all the evolutionists.

The evidence he produces is formidable and even the most brainwashed reader must surely acknowledge that the evidence against the great myth of macroevolution is overwhelming. There is cold comfort for the evolutionist in examining the fossil records which display neither evidence of "missing-links" or "sudden leaps". Nor is there any comfort to be found in Genetics for, as Michael Denton states, 'In terms of their basic biochemical design.... no living system can be thought as being primitive or ancestral with respect to any other system, nor is there the slightest empirical hint of an evolutionary sequence among all the incredibly diverse cells on earth.'

All the evidence produced by Mr Keane, which includes that from Entropy (an application of the laws of thermodynamics) and an examination of the means by which the earth's age has been hitherto determined, leads him to the conclusion that 'It requires a far greater act of faith to believe that the universe and everything in it has come about by accident than to believe it is the work of an omnipotent Creator.'

Evolution is a faith and its influence has been particularly noticeable in the totalitarian regimes of Communist countries and Nazi Germany. In Apropos we recently examined the proposals of a "nationalist" whose political manifesto contained genetic-engineering designed to help evolution along, coupled with euthanasia for the mentally and physically sub-normal. When man is no longer considered a creature made in the image and likeness of his Creator but only as the product of a random mix of cosmic debris then he becomes disposable. "Creation Rediscovered" examines the effects of evolutionary thought on philosophy and religion (particularly in the field of modern biblical criticism) and demonstrates the malign influence that has arisen from it.

Mr Keane presents good arguments, the book is full of valuable quotations and we recommend that our readers use it to help debunk "the greatest cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century".

ASF

Creation Science :

Catholic Organisations

DAYLIGHT

[formerly CESHE:UK]

Creation Science for Catholics

Publishes quarterly Newsletter "DAYLIGHT".

Organises talks, meetings and film shows.

Promotes literature, audio and video tapes relevant to Origins, Science and Christianity.

Annual Subscription £5 [UK and Ireland]

\$15 cash, USA/Australia.

sterling equivalent - other countries.

19 Francis Avenue, St.Albans, Herts AL3 6BL.

ceshe
(Belgium)

CERCLE SCIENTIFIQUE ET HISTORIQUE

*Created in 1971 to preserve
and publish the works of
Bernard Goussier (1912-1987)*

[N.B. in French] *dedicated to demonstrating
that scientific facts cannot contradict the
traditional doctrines of the Christian Faith.
Quarterly magazine : "Science et Foi".*

CESHE, 3 Pl

CESHE-FRANCE,

JURNAL

O CROIX



Newman Graduate Education

Founded to promote and defend
Christian faith and morality in
Australia.

Publishes Newsletters designed to alert parents and
children to the dangers of false science, pseudo-psychology
and erroneous ethics as promoted in the media and education.

N.G.E., [redacted] SW 2086.

ooOoo

Christus Vincit Productions

For Catholic books and tapes - see back page (Daylight 2)

ooOoo

*** Creation Ex Nihilo

Magazine of the Creation Science Foundation of Australia.
Excellent quality quarterly. £10.50 p/a. Recommended.

Creation Magazine, [redacted]

Swindon, [redacted]

ooOoo

*** = non-Catholic

Non-Catholic Organisations

*** Creation Science Movement

Publishes many pamphlets and bimonthly journal "Creation". Organises meetings and debates. Mainly concerned with the scientific issues. Founded in 1932 (as the Evolution Protest Movement), CSM is the leading creationist group in the UK. Well worth supporting - only £5 per annum.

CSM, 50 Brecon [redacted]

ooOoo

*** Creation Resources Trust

Publishes a range of attractive literature and Newsheets, including Our World for children and Original View for students. Good range of books and tapes supplied - also tapes, slides and videos for rental. Send s.a.e. for samples. Invaluable resource centre - recommended.

CRT, [redacted]

ooOoo

*** The Biblical Creation Society

Expounds and defends the Biblical teaching on creation. Useful range of literature produced. Audio-visual materials produced and loaned. Organises meetings and conferences. More 'evangelical' emphasis than CSM.

BCS, [redacted]

SY.